

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**  
**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT FOR**  
**BRAC 2005 RECOMMENDATIONS**  
**CLOSURE, DISPOSAL, AND REUSE OF THE**  
**BURLINGTON MEMORIAL**  
**UNITED STATES ARMY RESERVE CENTER**  
**MIDDLETOWN, IOWA**

On September 8, 2005, the Defense Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) Commission recommended that the Department of Defense close the Burlington Memorial United States Army Reserve Center (Burlington USARC or the property) in Middletown, Iowa and relocate units to a new Armed Forces Reserve Center with an Organizational Maintenance and Vehicle Storage Facility on Iowa Army Ammunition Plant in Middletown, Iowa. The deactivated USARC property is excess to Army need and will be disposed of according to applicable laws and regulations.

Pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR Parts 1500-1508) for implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and Environmental Analysis of Army Actions (32 CFR 651), the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the United States Army Reserve, 88<sup>th</sup> Regional Support Command (RSC) of the potential environmental and socioeconomic effects associated with the closure, disposal, and reuse of the Burlington USARC.

The EA analyzes the environmental impacts of the proposed closure, disposal, and reuse of the Burlington USARC.

## **PROPOSED ACTION**

The proposed action is the closure and disposal of the Burlington USARC. Redevelopment and reuse of the surplus property made available by the closure of the Burlington USARC would occur as a secondary action resulting from disposal.

Under BRAC law, the Army was required to close the Burlington USARC no later than September 15, 2011. The Burlington USARC was closed on September 13, 2011 and the Army will dispose of the property (USAR 2011). As a part of the disposal process, the Army screened the property for reuse with the Department of Defense and other Federal agencies. No Federal agency expressed an interest in reusing this property for another purpose.

## **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED**

### **Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative**

Under the No Action Alternative, the Army would continue operations at the Burlington USARC at levels similar to those that occurred prior to the BRAC Commission's recommendations for closure becoming final. The inclusion of the No Action Alternative is prescribed by the CEQ regulations implementing NEPA and serves as a benchmark against which the environmental

impacts of the action alternatives may be evaluated. The Reserve mission at the USARC has ended and it is unlikely that it would ever resume, given the recommendation of the BRAC Commission. Nevertheless, this no action alternative allows comparison of impacts between the prior mission, the current caretaker status, and the proposed reuse. Therefore, the No Action Alternative is evaluated in the EA.

### **Alternative 2 – Caretaker Status**

The Army secured the Burlington USARC after it was closed on September 13, 2011 to ensure public safety and the security of remaining government property. From the time of operational closure until conveyance of the property, the Army will provide sufficient maintenance to preserve and protect the site for reuse in an economical manner that facilitates redevelopment. If the Burlington USARC is not transferred, the Army will reduce maintenance levels to the minimum level for surplus government property as specified in 41 CFR §§ 102-75.945 and 102-75.965, and Army Regulation 420-1 (Army Facilities Management).

### **Alternative 3 – Traditional Army Disposal and Reuse of the Burlington USARC – Sale for Adult/Community Education Center**

For Alternative 3, the Army would transfer the property via a sale to private parties. The property would be transferred in “as-is condition” with approximately 11 acres being used for an adult/community education center.

Potential adult/community education center reuses could include, but are not limited to, centers for vocational training, higher education, or local community outreach. Under this reuse alternative, the analysis assumes the current USARC buildings are to be renovated and reused.

### **Alternative 4 – Traditional Army Disposal and Reuse of the Burlington USARC – Sale for Full Build-out as Residential**

For Alternative 4, the Army would transfer the property via a sale to private parties. The property would be transferred in “as-is condition” with approximately 11 acres being used for residential development.

Based on the residential land use near the Burlington USARC, residential reuse of the property is likely to range from 1 to 6 dwelling units per acre. Potential residence types include, but are not limited to, single or multi-family homes, townhouses, condominiums/apartment complexes, or mobile/manufactured homes. Under this reuse alternative, the analysis assumes the current USARC buildings are to be demolished and residential dwellings will be constructed.

In the Base Realignment and Closure Manual for Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (2006), Table 4-1: Land Use Intensity Parameters characterizes residential land use by using intensity parameters to evaluate how intensely a site will be reused. For the purposes of this EA, a medium-low intensity (2-6 dwelling units per acre) residential reuse of the property will be analyzed for complete development of the property as residential housing.

### **Alternative 5 – Traditional Army Disposal and Reuse of the Burlington USARC – Sale for Full Build-out as Light Commercial/Industrial**

For Alternative 5, the Army would transfer the property via a sale to private parties. The property would be transferred in “as-is condition” with approximately 11 acres being used for commercial/industrial use.

Potential light commercial/industrial reuses could include, but are not limited to, retail, child care, early childhood development center, repair services, storage units, warehousing, manufacturing, fabrication, commercial indoor/outdoor recreation, food preparation and sales, or office space (local government or commercial). Under this reuse alternative, it is assumed the current USARC buildings would either be renovated and reused or new facilities constructed.

In the Base Realignment and Closure Manual for Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (2006), Table 4-1: Land Use Intensity Parameters characterizes land use by using intensity parameters to evaluate how intensely a site will be reused. A floor area ratio (FAR) is used to determine the intensity level of a reuse based on how much building development occurs at a site or across an area. Based on the current total building footprint (approximately 18,930 square feet) on the property (11 acres or approximately 479,160 square feet) there is a 0.04 FAR, which is a low intensity level use. For the purposes of this EA, a medium-low intensity level (0.05-0.10 FAR) reuse of the property will be analyzed to allow for the evaluation of complete development of the property for a light commercial/industrial reuse.

### **Alternative 6 – Traditional Army Disposal and Reuse of the Burlington USARC for Open Space/Recreation**

For Alternative 6, the Army would transfer the property to private parties. The property would be transferred in “as-is condition” with approximately 11 acres being used for open space/recreation.

Based on land use near the Burlington USARC and the size of the property, potential open space/recreation uses of the property could include, but are not limited to, agriculture, a public park, athletic fields, playgrounds, community gardens, or picnic areas. Under this reuse alternative, the analysis assumes the current USARC buildings are to be demolished and the property maintained as open space.

According to the Base Realignment and Closure Manual for Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (2006), a reuse that is comprised of undeveloped lands or uses that do not require substantial building or infrastructure improvements have a minimal level of activity and are, therefore, considered low level intensity reuses.

## **FACTORS CONSIDERED IN DETERMINING THAT NO ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT IS REQUIRED**

The EA, which is incorporated by reference into this Finding of No Significant Impact, examined potential effects of Alternative 1 (No Action), Alternative 2 (Caretaker Status), Alternative 3 (Traditional Army Disposal and Reuse of the Burlington USARC – Sale for Adult/Community Education Center), Alternative 4 (Traditional Army Disposal and Reuse of the Burlington USARC – Sale for Full Build-out as Residential), Alternative 5 (Traditional Army Disposal and Reuse of the Burlington USARC – Sale for Full Build-out as Light Commercial/Industrial), and Alternative 6 (Traditional Army Disposal and Reuse of the Burlington USARC for Open

Space/Recreation) on 12 resource categories including a detailed analysis of six resource categories: aesthetics and visual resources, land use (current and future development in the region of influence, installation land, and surrounding land), noise, socioeconomics (economic development, environmental justice, housing, protection of children, and public services), transportation (roadways and traffic), and utilities (wastewater/storm water). As documented in the EA, any remaining asbestos-containing material (ACM), lead-based paint (LBP), lead dust from the indoor firing range, and suspected polychlorinated biphenyl (PCB)-containing materials would not present a threat to human health or the environment because the new owner (the Grantee) would covenant and agree to undertake any abatement or remediation due to ACM, LBP, lead dust, or PCB-containing materials that may be required under applicable laws and regulations at no cost to the Army. In addition, the Grantee's use would be in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations relating to asbestos, LBP, lead dust, and PCBs.


## PUBLIC AVAILABILITY

Comments on the EA and FNSI were accepted during an extended public review period that began on September 20, 2013 and ended on November 17, 2013 in accordance with requirements specified in 32 CFR Part 651. The review period was initiated by placing a Notice of Availability of the Final EA and Draft FNSI in the *Hawk Eye* on September 20, 2013. Due to a publication error the Notice of Availability was also published in the *Des Moines Register* on October 19, 2013 resulting in an extended public review period. The EA and Draft FNSI were available at the Burlington Public Library (210 Court Street, Burlington, Iowa 52601), the Danville Public Library (112 North Main Street, Danville, Iowa 52632), the Mount Pleasant Public Library (307 East Monroe Street, Mount Pleasant, Iowa 52641) and the Army's BRAC website at: [http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/env\\_ea\\_review.htm](http://www.hqda.army.mil/acsim/brac/env_ea_review.htm).

During the public review period, the 88<sup>th</sup> RSC received one comment letter from the USEPA Region VII. In the letter, the USEPA Region 7 stated that they have no additional comments to add to the EA. The Army determined no changes in the analysis presented in the EA were necessary. The EA's conclusion that there will be no significant impacts resulting from implementing the Proposed Action's alternatives remains unchanged.

## CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis in the Environmental Assessment and comments received, the 88<sup>th</sup> RSC determined that implementation of any of the Proposed Action's alternatives would have no significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts on the quality of the natural or human environment. Because no significant environmental impacts will result from implementation of the Proposed Action's alternatives, issuance of a Finding of No Significant Impact is warranted, and preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

  
KURT F. WAGNER  
Colonel, US ARMY  
Director, Public Works  
88<sup>th</sup> Regional Support Command

Date 20 Nov 2013